Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUN 2 9 1994

In the Matter of)				FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Price Cap Performance Review)	CC	Docket	No.	94-1
for Local Exchange Carriers)				

REPLY COMMENTS OF TELEPORT COMMUNICATIONS GROUP INC.

Teleport Communications Group Inc. ("TCG") offers the following reply comments in response to the comments of the Regional Bell Operating Companies ("RBOC") and the United States Telephone Association ("USTA") regarding price cap reform.

The RBOC and USTA Comments claim that revision to the existing price cap rules is necessary to meet expanding competition. These claims are false.

Many LECs cite this Commission's collocation decisions as leading to expanded competition. Since those comments were filed, the centerpiece of the Commission's policies, physical collocation, has been reversed by the Court of Appeals. This finding that the Commission lacked the authority to mandate physical collocation will diminish, not increase, the prospects for competition.

Many LECs claim that their competitors are subject to

No. of Copies rec'd 1+4 List ABCDE

¹See Bell Atlantic Comments at p. 4; NYNEX Comments at 16; Pacific Bell & Nevada Bell Comments at 77; U S WEST Comments at 60.

²Bell Atlantic Tel. Co. v. F.C.C., No. 92-1619 (D.C. Cir. June 10, 1994).

substantially reduced tariff and regulatory burdens.³ Since those comments were filed, the Supreme Court has found that the Commission lacks the authority to forebear from tariff regulation for nondominant carriers,⁴ and the LEC attacks on the Commission's rate range rules will now begin at the Court of Appeals. These events will also diminish, not increase, the prospects for competition.

Many LECs claim that changes in technology and markets demand price cap revision. But the technology and market changes referenced are either far off in the future, relate to different markets -- or even relate to increases in the LEC's market opportunities in other fields (video dial tone). The Commission must also understand that the availability of technology does not mean that it is legally permissible or economically feasible to put such technology to use.

Many LECs point to the existence of potential competitors as a justification for further pricing flexibility. RBOCs argue unconvincingly that accurate views of competitive pressure are

³See Pacific Bell & Nevada Bell Comments at p. 67; U S WEST Comments at 62.

MCI Telecommunications Corporation v. AT&T, Nos. 93-356 and 93-521, slip opinion, June 17, 1994.

⁵See Bell Atlantic Comments at pp. 2-3; NYNEX Comments at 18; U S WEST Comments at 70.

⁶See Ameritech Comments at p. 30; NYNEX Comments at pp. 16-17.

reflected in the presence of potential sources of competition.⁷
LECs have created an apocalyptic atmosphere, speculating that the advent of PCS and the expected provision of telephony services by CATV companies will "soon" provide customers with LEC service.⁸
Many RBOCs claim that the convergence of technologies will change the marketplace and provide additional sources of competition.⁹

The Commission should institute regulatory changes only when actual, measurable market changes justify such revisions. While much time and effort has been spent divining the future marketplace, current market realities are ignored. Today, local exchange carriers control 99% of the interstate access market of the two largest consumers of access and even more of the total exchange market. The potential for competitive entry cannot be considered significant or threatening to the LECs when the LECs have 99% of the market and the protection of operational, legal, and economic barriers to entry or effective competition.

Many LECs, and USTA, claim that the Commission should use market measures of "addressability" or theoretical competition to evaluate whether price cap changes are needed. Addressability

⁷See Ameritech Comments at p. 30; see also Pacific Bell & Nevada Bell Comments at 77.

^{*}See U S WEST Comments at 70; Pacific Bell & Nevada Bell Comment at 95 & 94.

⁹See NYNEX Comments at 12.

¹⁰See also BellSouth Comments at p. 81; Southwestern Bell Comments, Appendix COMP at 9; Bell Atlantic Comments at 20; Pacific Bell & Nevada Bell Comments at 100; GTE Comments at 47.

is based on the physical presence of alternative providers with the capacity and geographic coverage to serve a substantial portion of the market -- irrespective of whether they actually do serve that market, or whether their networks can in fact be extended to serve those customers. Frankly, this issue is one which differs from situation to situation, and can turn on factors as variable as the willingness of a landlord to permit access, whether rights of way are available or must be acquired, and whether municipal or other licenses would be required. A customer cannot be presumed to have a competitive alternative available until it actually is available.

Despite LEC claims that the "future is now," the simple reality is that the marketplace will continue to be non-competitive until local exchange competition is legal, economically viable and technically feasible. That reality is far off in most jurisdictions, 12 and recent legal developments

¹¹See USTA Comments at 58-62.

¹²CAPs have never been authorized to offer local exchange services, except in Maryland, Washington and New York (and there only recently). No CAPs are currently offering local exchange services in any of these states, since the operational, technical and economic prerequisites to such competition are not yet in place.

certainly do not hasten its arrival. Accordingly, the LECs require no relaxation of price cap rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Manning Lee Senior Regulatory Counsel

Teleport Communications Group Inc.

One Teleport Drive

Staten Island, N.Y. 10311

(718) 983-2671

June 29, 1994

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jean M. Layton, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of Teleport Communications Group Inc. was mailed, first class, postage prepaid, this 29th day of June, 1994 to the following:

Mary McDermott United States Telephone Assoc. 1401 H Street, N.W. Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20005

Lawrence P. Keller Cathey, Hutton & Assoc., Inc. 3300 Holcomb Bridge Road Suite 286 Norcross, GA 30092

Edward R. Wholl Campbell L. Ayling The NYNEX Telephone Company 120 Bloomingdale Road White Plains, NY 10605

Michael S. Pabian, Esq. Ameritech Room 4H76 Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Elizabeth Dickerson MCI Telecommunications Corporation 1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Alan J. Gardner Jeffrey Sinsheimer California Cable Television Association 4341 Piedmont Avenue Oakland, CA 94611

Frank W. Lloyd Kecia Boney Mintz, Levin, Cohn 701 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20004 Terry L. Murray Murray and Associates 101 California Street Suite 4225 San Francisco, CA 94111

Michael E. Glover Edward D. Shakin Bell Atlantic Telephone Co. 1701 H Street, N.W. 8th Floor Washington, D.C. 20006

Jay C. Keithley
Leon M. Kestenbaum
Sprint Corporation
1850 M Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20034

W. Richard Morris Sprint Corporation P.O. Box 11315 Kansas City, MO 64112

W. Theodore Pierson, Jr. Richard J. Metzger Pierson & Tuttle 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 607 Washington, D.C. 20036

Heather Gold ALTS 1200 19th Street, N.W. Suite 607 Washington, D.C. 20036

Allen J. Arlow Computer & Communications Industry Association 666 11th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Charles A. Zielinski Rogers & Wells 607 14th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

David Cosson Stephen E. Watkins National Telephone Cooperative Philip F. McClelland Association 2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

Emily C. Hewitt Vincent L. Crivella General Services Administration 18th & F Streets, N.W. Room 4002 Washington, D.C. 20405

David C. Bergmann Yvonne T. Ranft Office of the Consumers' Counsel State of Ohio 77 South High Street 15th Floor Columbus, OH 43266-0550

James S. Blaszak Francis E. Fletcher, Jr. Gardner, Carton & Douglas 1301 K Street, N.W. Suite 900 - East Tower Washington, D.C. 20005

Dr. Lee L. Selwyn Dr. David J. Roddy Economics and Technology, Inc.

One Washington Mall Boston, MA 02018

David R. Poe Cherie R. Kiser LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20009-5728

Paul B. Jones Janis A. Stahlhut Time Warner Communications 300 First Stamford Place

Stamford, CT 60692-6732

Susan M. Baldwin Patricia D. Kravtin Economics and Technology, Inc. One Washington Mall Baton, MA 02108

Office of Attorney General Irwin A. Popowsky Office of Attorney General 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120

James T. Hannon Sharon L. Naylor Suite 700 1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

James P. Tuthill John W. Bogy Pacific Bell 140 New Montgomery Street Room 1530-A San Francisco, CA 94105

James L. Wurtz Nevada Bell 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

Andrew D. Lipman Russell M. Blau Swidler & Berlin 3000 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007

Peter A. Rohrbach Linda L. Oliver Hogan & Hartson Columbia Square 555 13th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-1109

Joseph Miller John Gammie Blaine Giles WilTel, Inc. P.O. Box 21348 Tulsa, OK 74121 Gary M. Epstein James H. Barker Latham & Watkins Suite 1300 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-2505

M. Robert Sutherland Richard M. Sbaratta 4300 Southern Bell Center 675 West Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, GA 30375

Mark C. Rosenblum Robert J. McKee AT&T Corporation Room 2255F2 295 Maple Avenue Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Marc E. Manly AT&T 1722 Eye Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Robert M. Lynch Richard C. Hartgrove Southwestern Bell Telephone Company One Bell Center Room 3520 St. Louis, MO 63101

A. Richard Metzger, Jr. Chief, Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 500 Washington, D.C. 20554

ITS 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 246 Washington, D.C. 20554

Jean M. Layton